

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Application. No. :	09/522,325	Confirmation No. 2790
Applicant :	Mohammad R. Zonoun	
Filed :	03-09-2000	
TC/A.U. :	2617	
Examiner :	Nghi H. Ly	
Docket No. :	003239.P059	
Customer No. :	8791	

Commissioner for Patents  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria VA 22313-1450

**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENTS**

Sir:

In the Office Action mailed June 22, 2010, the Examiner contends that Applicants claim two distinct species; namely, Species 1, including claims 1-20, and 61-120; and Species 2, including claims 21-60. Thus, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 121, the Examiner requires Applicant to restrict the application to one of the alleged two species.

Applicant submits that the requirement is improperly made because it does not specifically point out the reason(s) why the species are distinct. The particular reasons relied on by the examiner for holding that the inventions as claimed are either independent or distinct should be concisely stated. A mere statement of conclusion is inadequate. The reasons upon which the conclusion is based should be given. MPEP 808.01 and 809.02(a).

However, in the interest of expediting prosecution of the application and in compliance with 35 U.S.C. §121, Applicant responds to the restriction requirement as follows:

- (1) Election of species to be examined: Species 1
- (2) Identification of claims encompassing the elected species: Claims 1-20, and 60-120